REMARKS

Claims 6, 8, 16 and 18 have been canceled. Thus, Claims 1, 3-5, 7, 9-11, 13-15, 17 and 19-23 remain pending in this application. Claims 1, 7, 9, 11, 17 and 19 have been amended. Claim 1 has been amended merely to incorporate Claims 6 and 8, while Claim 11 has been amended merely to incorporate Claims 16 and 18. In addition, Claims 7, 9, 17 and 19 have been amended merely to provide proper claim dependency due to the cancellation of Claims 6, 8, 16 and 18. Since none of these amendments change the scope of the claimed subject matter, Applicant respectfully requests entry of these amendments.

Claims 1, 6, 7, 11, 16, 17 and 23 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Narayanan* (U.S. Patent Number 7,346,771) in view of *Ananian* (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0028451. In addition, Claims 3-5, 8-10, 13-15 18-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Narayanan* in view of *Ananian* and further in view of *Ramstrom*, (U.S. Patent No. 5,960,004).

In the Examiner Interview, Applicant argued that the combination of *Narayanan*, *Ananian* and *Ramstrom* did not teach or suggest Applicant's invention as recited in Claim 8 and all intermediate claims. In addition, Applicant argued that the combination of *Narayanan*, *Ananian* and *Ramstrom* did not teach or suggest Applicant's invention as recited in Claim 18 (which has scope similar to Claim 8) and all intermediate claims.

For exemplary purposes, Claim 8 recites: "wherein said means for calculating comprises: a software engine configured to receive the request for the inter-provider IP service, calculate pricing scenarios using the request, obtain real-time resource information including the availability information, calculate real-time prices for each of the pricing scenarios using the real-time resource information and customize the cost information based on knowledge of the identities of the first service provider and the second service provider, the request and the real-time prices" (emphasis added).

In addition, Claim 8 is dependent upon Claim 6 which recites: "means for calculating cost information in real-time for use of the additional resources for the inter-provider IP service prior to provisioning the inter-provider IP service; and means for comparing the cost information to cost requirement information associated with the request to determine whether to utilize the additional resources for the inter-provider IP service" (emphasis added).

On page 8 of the Final Office Action of May 27, 2009, the Examiner indicated that Claim 8 was taught by *Narayanan* (U.S. Patent Number 7,346,771) in view of *Ramstrom* et al., (U.S. Patent No. 5,960,004). In particular, the Examiner stated that *Ramstrom* et al disclosed "a method for calculating cost information by configuring software in the application service modules such as transaction manager and charging manager to generate a record of the cost to the subscriber's account [Ramstrom, Column 38, Lines 22-63, Column 41, Lines 45-56]."

However, *Ramstrom* merely teaches calculating the cost during/after a call, not before a call is provisioned. In addition, what is calculated in *Ramstrom* is not really a "pricing scenario", but rather it is the actual cost of a call. If the Examiner's position is that one could use the actual cost information (i.e., cost history of previous calls) to determine the "pricing scenarios," Applicant notes that in this interpretation of *Ramstrom,* the cost information is not "real-time" based on "real-time resources," as claimed in Claims 6 and 8.

During the Examiner Interview, an agreement was reached that the combination of *Narayanan, Ananian* and *Ramstrom* did not teach Claim 8 and its intermediate claims for at least the above reasons. In addition, an agreement was reached that the combination of *Narayanan, Ananian* and *Ramstrom* did not teach Claim 18 and its intermediate claims for at least the above reasons. Therefore, Applicant has amended independent Claim 1 to incorporate Claim 8 (and its intermediate Claim 6), and independent Claim 11 to incorporate Claim 18 (and its intermediate Claim 16).

As a result, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the § 103 rejections of Claims 1, 3-5, 7, 9-11, 13-15, 17 and 19-23.

<u>CONCLUSION</u>

For the above reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that the Application in condition for allowance. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of the claims be withdrawn and full allowance granted. Should the Examiner have any further comments or suggestions, please contact the undersigned at the number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

AYMAN ESAN NASSAR

Dated: <u>August 4, 2009</u>

/Holly L. Rudnick/
Holly L. Rudnick
Reg. No. 43,065

Garlick, Harrison & Markison
P.O. Box 160727
Austin, Texas 78716-0727
(Direct) (214) 387-8097
(Fax) (214) 387-7949
(Email) *hrudnick@texaspatents.com*